

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

Maxine S. Suggs)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Civil Action No.: 07-3911-TLW-TER
)	
North Strand OB/GYN, P.C.,)	
Chris McCauley, M.D., and)	
Breton Juberg, M.D.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

ORDER

Plaintiff, Maxine S. Suggs (“plaintiff”), brought this civil action, *pro se*, on December 5, 2007. (Doc. #1). The defendants filed a Motion for Summary Judgment on August 22, 2008. (Doc. #34). The plaintiff filed a Response in Opposition on September 29, 2008. (Doc. #44). The defendants filed a Reply to the plaintiff’s Response on September 30, 2008. (Doc. #45).

This matter now comes before this Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III, to whom this case had previously been assigned. (Doc. #50). In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the District Court grant defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment as to all federal claims asserted by the plaintiff, and that the Court decline to exercise jurisdiction over any state law claims. (Doc. #50). The plaintiff filed objections to the report. (Doc. #52). In conducting this review, the Court applies the following standard:

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to the Court, to which any party may file written objections...The Court is not bound by the recommendation of the magistrate judge but, instead, retains responsibility for the final determination. The Court is required to make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or

specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which no objections are addressed. While the level of scrutiny entailed by the Court's review of the Report thus depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, the Court is free, after review, to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's findings or recommendations.

Wallace v. Housing Auth. of the City of Columbia, 791 F. Supp. 137, 138 (D.S.C. 1992)

(citations omitted).

In light of the standard set forth in Wallace, the Court has reviewed, de novo, the Report and the objections. After careful review of the Report, the objections thereto, and relevant case law, the Court **ACCEPTS** the Report. (Doc. #50).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Terry L. Wooten
United States District Judge

January 14, 2009
Florence, South Carolina